

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 672

EA 024 356

TITLE The Principals Institute, 1990-92.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY.
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE May 92
NOTE 69p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, New
York City Public Schools, 110 Livingston Street, Room
507, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Elementary Secondary
Education; *Females; Graduate Study; Higher
Education; *Institutes (Training Programs);
*Leadership Training; Masters Programs; *Minority
Groups; Principals; *School Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Bank Street College of Education NY

ABSTRACT

A major goal of the Bank Street College of Education Principals Institute program is to increase the pool of women and minorities prepared for careers as school administrators. Candidates nominated by superintendents of several school districts went through a rigorous review process before being selected to participate. Students in the institute attend classes for three academic semesters and one summer. Participants work in their regular job the first semester and attend weekly evening classes. In the second semester, they work in a public school outside their "home" district under a mentor principal's guidance and attend evening advisement classes. In the third semester, students return to their regular school positions and attend evening classes. During June, participants attend evening classes. After successfully completing the program, participants receive a master's degree with a concentration in educational leadership and are eligible for New York State certification as a school administrator and supervisor. The program has been successful in achieving its goals. By June 1992, 27 out of 34 respondents to the 1991-92 followup survey (79.4 percent) were working in supervisory/administrative capacities; 3 of these respondents attained acting principalships. All received New York State certification. Respondents' program ratings are discussed, along with conclusions and recommendations. Appendices contain tables of gender/minority pedagogical supervisor figures for New York City and followup survey data. (MLH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED350672

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



OREA Report

The Principals Institute
1990-92

EA 024 356

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**The Principals Institute
1990-92**



NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

H. Carl McCall
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

5/92

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND DESIGN

Educational researchers have criticized current programs used to train and accredit aspiring school principals in the U.S. for not requiring candidates to demonstrate leadership skills. In addition, although the majority of students in the New York City public schools are African American or Latino and most classroom teachers are women, according to 1990 school system data, 70 percent of the school principals are white and 62 percent are men.

In December 1988, Bank Street College of Education received a grant from the Aaron Diamond Foundation to plan a leadership development program for prospective school principals. A major goal of the Principals Institute program, which has been developed in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education, is to increase the pool of women and/or minorities prepared for careers as school administrators.

A six-member advisory committee developed the program design and selected 13 community school districts and two high school superintendencies (most of which had few minority or women administrators or supervisors) to participate in the first phase of the program. Superintendents from 11 of the districts nominated 64 potential candidates, 18 of whom were selected to start classes in September 1989. Additional districts nominated a second cohort of participants, which began classes in January 1990, while a third cohort, which began the program in September 1990, was nominated by the remaining districts. All nominees went through a rigorous review process before being selected to participate.

Students in the Institute attend classes for three academic semesters and one summer:

- Participants work in their regular job during the first semester while they attend weekly evening classes.
- In the second semester, participants work in a public school outside their district under the guidance of a mentor principal, and attend advisement sessions in the evening. The school internship is supplemented by work in district offices and a day-long seminar on community-based organizations' and schools' cooperative relations.
- In the third semester, participants return to their regular position within the school system and attend evening classes.
- During the summer, participants attend evening classes twice a week during the month of June.

Advisement, guest speakers, trips, and intervisitations to internship sites and other school sites in New York City are also elements of the program. Upon successful completion of the program, participants receive a Master's degree with a concentration in educational leadership from Bank Street College and are eligible for New York State certification as a school administrator and supervisor.

PROGRAM FINDINGS

The program was implemented as intended, and has been successful in increasing the pool of minorities and women who are qualified for administrative and supervisory positions in the New York City public schools. By June 1992, 27 out of 34 respondents to the 1991-92 follow-up participant survey, 79.4 percent, were working in supervisory/administrative capacities and three of these respondents, 8.8 percent, attained interim acting principalships. Moreover, all program participants received New York State certification, with the exception of one who was already licensed before entering the program.

Virtually all participants rated the internship as the most valuable part of the program, and some felt that it should be lengthened to one year. However, they also liked many of the other program elements, including advisement, guest speakers, intervisitations, and trips. A number said that the admissions and selection procedures should remain the same, but that information about the Institute should be disseminated more widely.

Most participants felt strongly that the tuition should continue to be subsidized, and said that if necessary, the program should accept fewer participants rather than making participants pay the tuition costs. Concomitantly, they suggested that future participants be required to make a longer-term commitment to continue working in the public schools.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall results indicate that the Principals Institute has proven to be an excellent and effective means of developing the groundwork for creating a more diverse and multicultural staff throughout the administrative level of the NYC Public Schools. In light of our findings OREA recommends that:

- program administrators and the NYC Board of Education endeavor to implement more proactive mechanisms for program graduates to secure information on principalship and other administrative vacancies; and
- program administrators should continue their recruitment, selection and program modification activities so that they can further enlarge the pool of eligible minority and female NYC Public School administrators and supervisors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Special Projects and the Research Units of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) of the New York City Public Schools. Carolyn Jarvis conducted the study and wrote the evaluation report. The development and implementation of the follow-up survey, as well as data collection and report narratives were provided by Mabel Payne and Ira Brandenburg. The final draft was edited by Roberta Lynch and Carol Meyer, and word processed by Adetokunbo Sosanya.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Ms. Mabel Payne
Research Unit
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
New York City Public Schools
110 Livingston St - Room 507
Brooklyn, New York 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Women and Minorities in Educational Leadership Positions	1
Formation of the Principals Institute	3
The Evaluation Study	3
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	5
Program Planning	5
Participant Recruitment, Selection, and Demographics	5
Program Structure	9
Program Funding	16
III. FINDINGS	20
Program Structure	21
Program Update	26
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
V. APPENDICES	
Appendix A: School System Pedagogical Supervisors by Gender and Ethnicity	32
Appendix B: Principals Institute 1991-92 Follow-Up Survey	35
Appendix C: References	45

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

	PAGE
TABLE 1: Number of Principals Institute Nominations, Applications, Interviews, and Selections, for Cohorts I - III	8
TABLE 2: Demographic Characteristics of Principals Institute Participants by Cohort	10
TABLE 3: Distribution of 1990-1991 Principals Institute Costs	17
TABLE 3A: Distribution of 1990-1991 Principals Institute Costs	19
FIGURE 1: Principals Institute Program Sequence (1989-91)	14

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

A number of studies of school effectiveness have identified the leadership of the school principal as a crucial factor in a school's success. According to the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (1972),

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. (S)he is the person responsible for all of the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become . . . if students are performing to the best of their ability one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success. (p.305)

Although the need for competent and creative leadership is universally acknowledged, most educational experts also believe that the methods used to train and accredit aspiring school principals in the United States are not designed to produce outstanding educational leaders. In New York City, for example, qualifying to become a school principal is mostly dependent on successful completion of academic requirements. Although a supervised internship has also been required, internships have generally focused more on administrative tasks rather than on leadership building.

WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

Although the majority of teachers throughout the nation are women, most school supervisors are men. In a national study conducted by the American Association of School Administrators, Jones and Montenegro (1988) reported that only 3.7 percent of the

superintendents, 22.5 percent of the assistant superintendents, and 23.9 percent of the principals were women. Even fewer African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities of either sex become educational administrators. In 1988, only 1.5 percent of the school superintendents, 7.5 percent of the assistant superintendents, and 10.3 percent of the school principals were African Americans.

In New York City, white pupils have been in the minority for over 20 years, and today constitute less than 20 percent of the student population. School principals and other school administrators, however, have continued to be predominately white, and male. (See Appendix A). According to 1990 school system data, 70 percent of the school principals are white, and 62 percent are men.

In August 1988, the New York City Board of Education issued a restatement of the Equal Employment Opportunity Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) Policy and in March 1990 adopted an EEO/AA Plan. Districts and central divisions which underutilize minorities and/or women are required to develop and implement effective recruitment and staff development programs. The Chancellor is responsible for setting long term systemwide objectives for recruitment, promotions, and training.

In June 1991, an early retirement plan for principals was negotiated by representatives of the Board of Education and the Council of Supervisors and Administrators. As a result, at the time of this report, approximately one in four public school

principals had retired. This may provide a "window of opportunity" for qualified women and minorities who, heretofore, have been unable to "crack the system."

FORMATION OF THE PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE

Leading educators have suggested that school systems which are serious about educational improvement must invest in identifying and training new principals. They have also recommended that universities collaborate with school districts to develop training strategies which combine theoretical concepts of school administration with the relevant "field-based" skills needed by instructional leaders.

In December 1988, Bank Street College of Education received a two-year planning and development grant from the Aaron Diamond Foundation to plan a model leadership development program for training prospective school principals in collaboration with the New York City Board of Education. A major objective of the program is to increase the pool of women and/or minorities prepared for careers as school supervisors, administrators and principals. As such, although the program's objectives are inclusive of other supervisory and administrative positions, the program was named the Principals Institute.

THE EVALUATION STUDY

To evaluate the Principals Institute program, staff of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) reviewed program documents, interviewed program administrators, and met separately with each of the three classes which had participated in the program since its inception. Chapter II of this report is a program description, Chapter III presents the major evaluation

findings, and Chapter IV summarizes OREA's conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM PLANNING

A six-member advisory committee, composed of Bank Street College faculty, New York City public school principals, and an executive of an educational advocacy organization, was organized to plan the program and develop a funding strategy. Between January and August 1989, the advisory committee established working relationships with central administrators and community school district representatives, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Council of Supervisors and Administrators. They designed a recruitment and selection strategy to identify talented public school staff, developed academic course outlines, and planned a structured internship experience. Operational funding for the project was obtained from the New York City Board of Education, New York Community Trust, Overbrook Foundation, and Morgan Guaranty Trust.

Once the planning phase was completed, the advisory committee continued to meet at least bi-monthly to review program activities and assist program staff in planning.

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Recruitment

After consulting with Board of Education officials, the advisory committee selected 13 community school districts and two high school superintendencies, most of which had few minority and/or women administrators or supervisors, to participate in the

first phase of the program. The president of Bank Street College personally contacted the superintendents of the 15 selected districts to enlist their support in identifying appropriate candidates within their district. Superintendents from 11 of the 15 districts nominated 64 potential candidates, 18 of whom were finally selected to participate in the first cohort, which started classes in September 1989.

Ten new community school districts and three high school superintendencies were invited to participate in the second cohort, which began classes in January 1990; nominations were received from all but two of the superintendents. Participants for the third cohort, which started in September 1990, were recruited from the remaining 13 community school districts, one high school superintendency, and from District 75 (citywide special education programs). All 16 superintendents nominated staff for the program. By the third cycle, all districts in New York City had been invited, and all but five of the 32 community school districts had recommended staff to participate in the Institute.

Selection

According to one of the Institute co-directors, the application and selection process was designed to identify people who are talented educators with demonstrated leadership ability, but who may not have as of yet decided to pursue a career as a school principal. Persons interested in applying to the Principals Institute must first obtain an endorsement from their

school-based management committee (if one exists) and/or be recommended by their principal or supervisor to the district or high school superintendent. After reviewing all recommendations, each superintendent can nominate up to four candidates from his or her district to the Principals Institute. The Institute then forwards a formal application package to the candidates.

The application consists of an autobiographical statement, several short essays, transcripts, and official letters of recommendation from a peer, a principal, and a superintendent. The completed application packages are reviewed by a committee which rates them in each of the following categories: leadership experience, leadership potential, writing skills, work with children, and work with adults. Using the ratings the committee selects 25 to 30 applicants to participate in a final interview.

For the final interview, applicants are scheduled in small groups, given a hypothetical role-playing situation, and asked to respond to it as a group. Their responses are videotaped and reviewed by an independent selection panel of education experts. Each applicant is rated based on his or her ability to communicate ideas clearly, work cooperatively, influence opinion, facilitate the group task, and contribute to task completion. The selection panel chooses a group of approximately 20 finalists for admission to the Institute.

As shown in Table 1, less than one-third of each group of those nominated to apply by their superintendents was actually selected to participate in the Institute.

Table 1

Number of Principals Institute Nominations, Applications,
Interviews, and Selections, by Cohort

	<u>Cohort 1</u>	<u>Cohort 2</u>	<u>Cohort 3</u>
Nominations	64	91	61
Applications	40	68	50
Interviews	25	30	19
Selections	18	19	20

- Less than one third of the candidates nominated for the Principals Institute were selected to participate.

According to program participants, most learned about the Institute directly from the principal of their school or from some other supervisor, who encouraged them to apply. Others saw notices posted in their schools. A few participants who first heard about the Institute from friends or colleagues then approached their supervisor and asked to be recommended for admission. During the group interviews, many of the participants admitted that, before being asked to apply to the Institute, they had not been sure they wanted to become a school administrator. According to one group, "We all felt we were good teachers but we needed that push from someone else, someone who saw something else in us to make us go further."

All of the participants described the application process as rigorous and carefully planned. Because they had been required to perform various tasks in a number of different situations they

believed the process gave Bank Street administrators ample information about each candidate on which to base selection decisions. They assumed that the process was intentionally made difficult in order to weed out those applicants who might not be serious. They felt confident that they had been accepted based on merit rather than political connections and were honored that they had been selected to participate. A number of participants said that going through the application process helped them clarify their own ideas about education and educational leadership. The majority of applicants already held at least a master's degree before enrolling in the Institute, and five were licensed as assistant principals.

Demographics

Table 2 shows demographic characteristics for participants in each of the first four cohorts. To date, all participants have been members of minority groups and/or women. However, Hispanics/Latinos have been underrepresented. Therefore, program administrators have given presentations at various Latino educators' organizations and conducted mail campaign to eligible Latino educators. These efforts have paid off-- whereas Latinos were only 12 percent of the 1991-92 semi-finalists, they are 33 percent of the 1992-93 semi-finalists.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

The Principals Institute is coordinated by two co-directors, with the help of an assistant director. Students in the Principals Institute attend classes for three academic semesters

TABLE 2
Demographic Characteristics of Principals Institute
Participants by Cohort

	Cohort I (N = 18)	Cohort II (N = 19)	Cohort III (N = 20)	Cohort IV (N = 21)
Age Range	30-52	32-54	29-57	33-55
Gender				
Females	13	17	15	17
Males	5	2	5	4
Ethnicity				
Black	11	10	12	11
Hispanic	4	4	4	3
Asian	--	2	1	--
Advanced Degree	12	13	11	17
Original Position				
Teacher	14	12	9	11
Staff Developer	--	3	5	1
Director/				
Coordinator	3	3	3	3
Ass't Principal	1	1	3	--
Other				2*

*These two participants are an Educational Evaluator and an Instructional Specialist.

- To date, all Institute participants have been members of minority groups and/or women. The majority of applicants already held at least a master's degree before enrolling in the Institute and five were licensed assistant principals.

and one summer. Participants work in their regular job during the first semester while they attend weekly evening classes. In the second semester the participants serve a full-time internship in a public school under the guidance of a mentor principal, and attend advisement sessions in the evening. The school internship is supplemented by work in district offices and education advocacy agencies. In the third semester, participants return to their regular position within the school system and attend evening classes. During the summer, participants attend evening classes twice a week during the month of June. Cohort I students served an additional internship in a summer program in July 1990. Cohort II students completed additional coursework during July 1991, and graduated at the end of that month. Upon successful completion of the program, participants receive a master's degree with a concentration in educational leadership from Bank Street College and are eligible for New York State certification as a school administrator and supervisor.

Intensive School Internship

The semester-long internship is considered to be the heart of the Principals Institute program. During this period, participants receive their full salary from the school system while they perform administrative duties under the direct supervision of a mentor principal. The placements, in districts different from their "home district," are arranged based on the individual intern's background and interests.

During the planning phase of the program, the advisory committee asked a variety of people to recommend persons who were considered to be "outstanding" school principals and compiled a list from which they recruited and selected the mentor principals, all of whom were recognized as being successful and innovative school leaders. As an incentive, the mentor principals each received \$1,000 to be used for their school and were invited to attend all special events held for interns.

The mentor principals are expected to assign administrative tasks that will help the intern become an effective supervisor, provide ongoing feedback to the intern, participate in periodic conferences with the intern and Bank Street advisor, and prepare a written evaluation of the mentee at the end of the internship. The mentor principals also agree to assist the intern to gain visibility as a potential administrator within their school district.

During the internship semester students in Cohorts I-II were also assigned to work for eight sessions under the direction of the agency director at a variety of educational advocacy or community-based organizations, including the Public Education Association, Advocates for Children, and Aspira of New York, Inc. (a Latino advocacy organization).

During July 1990, Cohort I students worked in the mornings in supervisory administrative positions in a variety of public school summer programs, and in the afternoons were assigned to community school district offices where they learned about

district office functions. The summer internship was discontinued after the first year. Cohorts II and III completed additional coursework during July 1991.

Because of city budget problems, the Board of Education did not have the funds needed to pay replacement salaries for Cohort III students so that they could participate in their originally scheduled internship semester during the spring of 1991. As a result, during the spring 1991 semester, Cohort II and Cohort III students were combined and both groups attended the classes originally designed for Cohort II participants. Cohort II completed the program at the end of the summer of 1991. Cohort III completed the internship semester and program at the end of the semester of fall 1991. Figure 1 shows the actual program sequence for each of the three cohorts.

Advisement System

The advisement system used in the Principals Institute follows the Bank Street advisement model used throughout the college. There are two advisors, one for participants teaching in elementary/junior high schools and one for those teaching in high schools, who assist the participants in integrating their academic work with their internship experiences in the schools. The advisors, who are both educators with public school and college-level experience, are each assigned nine to ten interns. During the internship semester participants meet once a week as a group with their advisor and individually once every two weeks.

Figure 1

Principals Institute Program Sequence (1989-1991)

TERM	COHORTS		
	I	II	III
Fall 1989	First Semester Coursework	Application & Selection	-----
Spring 1990	Internship	First Semester Coursework	Application & Selection
Summer 1990	Placement in Summer Programs/ District Offices	-----	-----
Fall 1990	Final Semester Coursework	Internship	First Semester Coursework
Spring 1991	-----	Additional Semester Coursework*	
Summer 1991	-----	Final Coursework	
Fall 1991	-----	-----	Internship

* In Spring 1991, Cohort III students joined the additional semester of classes planned for Cohort II.

- The total program sequence takes three academic semesters and one summer.

The advisors also visit the participants at their internship sites at least once every two weeks and meet with the mentor principals regularly to coordinate experiences.

Supplementary Activities

Intervisitations and trips. Several intervisitations to internship sites and other schools in New York City were planned to expose participants to a variety of school leadership styles. In addition, Cohort I and II interns spent two-and-a-half days in Miami where they met with Dade County Public School System administrators, visited a variety of schools, and observed school-based management "in action."

In addition, Cohort I and Cohort II interns participated in a weekend "Outward Bound-type" seminar sponsored by Boys Harbor (a community-based organization), focusing on team building, problem solving, and communication skills.

Guest speakers. Throughout the program a variety of guest speakers were invited to address groups of interns about contemporary struggles and challenges in public education within New York City. Prominent lecturers included New York City Public Schools' Chancellor Joseph Fernandez, former Board of Education President Gwendolyn Baker, United Federation of Teachers (UFT) President Sandra Feldman, City Councilman Herb Berman, and Colgate Palmolive Chief Executive Officer Reuben Mark.

PROGRAM FUNDING

In 1990-91 the Principals Institute received planning and development funding from the Aaron Diamond Foundation, and operational funding from the New York City Board of Education, Bank Street College of Education, New York Community Trust, the Overbrook Foundation, and Time-Warner Inc. Table 3 shows how 1990-91 program costs were to be distributed between the Board of Education and Bank Street College.

During the summer of 1990 the Board of Education approved funds for the Institute for the 1990-91 school year. In January 1991, as described earlier in this report, Bank Street College was notified that the Board of Education would not be able to underwrite the costs associated with replacement salaries and fringe benefits for the Cohort III interns for their internship semester, and that the program had to be modified.

Tuition at Bank Street College is \$365 per credit or \$10,950 for a 30 credit program. The comparable cost for a graduate program in educational administration and supervision at a graduate school in the City University system is \$1,102 per semester or \$2,850 for the entire program.

The Principals Institute costs about \$18,500 per participant for tuition and other special expenses, such as trips. Program administrators recognize that when "replacement" costs of approximately \$18,000 per participant for the internship semester are added to the tuition, the overall cost per program per participant is very high (see Table 3). In order to reduce the

Table 3
Distribution of 1990-1991 Principals Institute Costs

Program Component	NYC Board of Education	Bank Street College	Foundations/Corporations	TOTAL
Tuition	\$296,484	\$202,836	-	\$499,320
Director	43,550	43,550	-	87,100
OTPS	10,000	10,000	-	20,000
Overhead	24,966	24,966	-	49,932
Internship Replacement Salaries	\$638,400	-	-	\$638,400
Mentor Principal Grants				
Co-director			\$38,000	38,000
Intervisitations			\$87,100	87,100
Evaluation			\$20,000	20,000
			\$15,000	15,000
TOTALS	\$ 1,013,400	\$281,352	\$160,100	\$1,454,852

- The greatest percentage of program costs, 43.9 percent, were for internship replacement salaries. (Funds are no longer required for these costs for 1991-92 or 1992-93. See Table 3A.)

program budget, beginning in April 1991, all new program participants have been recruited from among those teachers and administrators who are eligible and have received approval from the Board of Education for sabbatical or other leave without pay. Participants will complete their internship semester while they are on leave, thus eliminating over 58 percent of the original program's costs, (see Tables 3 and 3A). Moreover, applicants who are approved for sabbatical or other leave and accepted in the Principals Institute will be required to continue service in the New York City public schools for at least three years after the leave.

Table 3A
Distribution of 1991-1992 Principals Institute Costs

Program Component	NYC Board of Education	Bank Street College	Foundations/Corporations	TOTAL
Tuition	\$262,141	\$232,199	-	\$494,340
Director	45,292	45,292	-	90,584
OTPS	15,000	15,000	-	30,000
Overhead	37,567	15,433	-	53,000
Mentor Principal Grants			\$41,000	41,000
Co-director			\$87,100	87,100
Intervisitations			\$35,000	35,000
Evaluation			\$15,000	15,000
TOTALS	\$360,000	\$307,924	\$178,100	\$846,624

- Total 1991-92 program costs are more than 58 percent less than 1990-91, as a result of the elimination of internship replacement salaries. (See Table 3).

III. FINDINGS

OREA staff conducted focus group interviews with members of each of the three classes that have participated in the Principals Institute to date. In addition, evaluators reviewed program documents, conducted interviews with program administrators, and asked program participants to complete two survey questionnaires, one administered during the 1990-1991 school year and a second administered in the Spring of 1992.

The first questionnaire was designed to collect information about participant perceptions of their internship experience and academic coursework. Questionnaires were returned to OREA by four of the 18 Cohort I participants (these students had already completed the program, and so were not on-site at the time of OREA's visits), 13 of the 19 members of Cohort II, and 11 of the 20 Cohort III students.

During the Spring of 1992, OREA researchers conducted a follow-up survey of Cohorts I-III participants. This survey was designed to determine program graduate placement and licensure status, as well as their reactions to their program experiences. Of the 54 questionnaires sent, 34 were returned.* The highest percentage of respondents in our sample were in Cohort III (41.2 percent). Another 38.2 percent were in Cohort II and 20.6 percent were in Cohort I. (See Table 1, in Appendix B).

* Errors in mailing labels precluded sending all 57 program participants questionnaires.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Participant Selection

Most of the participants recommended that the admissions and selection procedures remain the same as they were when they applied to participate in the program. They did suggest, however, that information about the Institute be more widely disseminated. One person worried that the type of visionary educator the application process is designed to identify may sometimes be viewed as a maverick within his or her own school, and thus may not be able to get the necessary principals' and/or superintendents' recommendations.

Intensive School Internship. On the first survey questionnaires, Cohort I and II participants most frequently cited the internship as the aspect of the program they found most valuable in preparing them for their new positions. One participant who had state certification as an administrator and supervisor and was already working as an assistant principal said she had applied to the Institute specifically so that she could participate in the duty-free internship. Some participants recommended that the internship be lengthened to a year.

During their internship semester, most participants said they "shadowed" their mentor principal for a few weeks and then were assigned real administrative responsibilities within the school. They discussed issues daily with their mentor principal and other school administrators and were party to the decisions principals must make on a daily basis. They said they were

recognized and treated as administrators by the school staff.

The following are two participants' descriptions of their internships:

My experience was a broad-based one. The principal was truly a mentor. He guided me philosophically and delegated various responsibilities to me. I had opportunities to interact with administrators, teaching staff, students, parents, custodial and lunchroom staffs. I worked as a grade advisor and staff developer in addition to performing many administrative tasks.

My mentor principal placed me on the other side of her desk. I had the opportunity to see how all business was conducted in the office, including cabinet meetings, parent-principal meetings, post-observation conferences, etc. I accompanied the principal on her many tours of the school plant and learned to look at the building in terms of student welfare and safety. My mentor principal actively taught me her job. She made her thinking processes explicit concerning instructional goals, leadership, staff development, interpersonal relationships with parents, teachers, students and the advisory council, SBM/SDM, etc.

Some participants who had previously completed other more traditional programs in administration and supervision said the range of experience they gained during this internship was totally different. In contrast, in other programs they remained in their regular job, usually as a classroom teacher. Although they were supposed to spend one to three periods a day with their internship supervisor, scheduling had actually been very haphazard, and sometimes they were lucky if they saw their supervisor for one or two periods a week. Even though they had sometimes participated in administrative meetings, they said that they never really felt privy to the actual running of the school.

Community Based Organization Internship. In response to questions about their work under the direction of an educational advocacy or community-based organization, participants were far less positive. Only a few Cohort I and II participants described their experiences as valuable, with one of them noting that, "It helped me to visualize how a school can successfully collaborate with a community agency and how important it is for a school administrator to reach out to agencies that can provide vital services to students."

About half of the Cohort II interns described their work with a community-based organization as the least valuable aspect of the program. They felt that the organizations to which they had been assigned did not know what to do with them, that the time allotted was too short to be productive, and that it took time away from their internship in the schools. They suggested that the community-based organizations (CBOs) be more carefully screened and that they be given written guidelines as to the kinds of activities to which interns could be assigned. They felt that this part of the program needed more careful planning.

As a result of participants reaction to this component, program administrators instituted a day-long seminar rather than the original CBO internship. Cohort III participants met with representatives from Alianza Dominicana, Grant Street Settlement House and United Way to share insights on developing effective CBO-school partnerships. The seminar's goal was to develop

skills and knowledge in the development of cooperative working relationships. Program administrators were please with participants' reactions to this program modification and, in future, will continue its implementation.

Advisement System

Almost all of the participants described the advisement system as very useful, and several identified it as the most valuable aspect of the program.

Supplementary Activities

Almost all participants considered the intervisitations within New York City and the trip to Dade County to be very useful. The majority of participants rated the weekend seminar sponsored by Boys Harbor as useful or very useful. A few Cohort II participants, however, identified it as the least valuable aspect of the program because they believed their cohort had already formed into a very cohesive group before attending the weekend. With one exception, the participants rated the guest speakers as useful or very useful.

Placement

Staff of the Principals Institute have attempted to keep community school boards, superintendents, and central administrators informed about the program since its inception. As a result, some community school districts have come to the Institute to recruit interns for supervisory vacancies.

1991 Survey Finding. Of the first cohort of 18 students, 17, 94.4 percent, completed the program in December 1990 and received

their master's degree in May 1991. Sixteen students', 88.8 percent, also received New York State School Administrator and Supervisor Certification, and 15, 83.33 percent, took and passed the New York City assistant principals' and/or principals' examinations offered in 1991. After completing the program, Cohort I participants continued to meet once a month with Institute staff to share information about job openings and other career possibilities. By August 1991, nine of the 17, 52.9 percent, had been hired in supervisory or administrative positions, three of them as interim acting principals.

The second cohort of 19 students completed the program in July 1991, and 15, 78.9 percent, passed the assistant principals' and/or principals' examinations as well. By August 1991 ten members of Cohort II, 52.6 percent, had also been placed in administrative positions.

Once they graduate, there is no guarantee that Principals Institute participants will be hired in an administrative or supervisory position. During the focus group interviews some of the Cohort I graduates who had to return to classroom teaching because they had not yet been able to secure new positions expressed anger and disillusionment. They felt that the investment the Board of Education had made in preparing them for a leadership position was being wasted.

*One participant had state certification and an assistant principal's license before entering the program.

PROGRAM UPDATE

1992 Follow-up Survey Findings. As of June 1992, over 29 percent of the respondents to the second survey cited teaching as their current school system position (two from Cohort I, five from Cohort II and three from Cohort III). The next most frequently cited current position was Assistant or Interim Acting Assistant Principal, indicated by 23.5 percent of the respondents. Three individuals, 8.8 percent (one from Cohort I and two from Cohort III), held interim acting principalships.

Most respondents currently hold the N.Y.C. licenses of Principal or Assistant Principal of day elementary or junior high schools (67.6 percent and 76.5 percent, respectively). A smaller proportion had Day High School or Assistant Principal licenses (20.6 percent and 20.6 percent, respectively). In all, 79.4 percent (N=27) of the respondents are functioning in an administrative/supervisory capacity. Most of these respondents found out about their current job by being recruited or interviewed by the District Superintendent (11 mentions) or were recommended by a school principal, often in the school where they had interned (four mentions). Supervisory individuals were hired as a result of an interview at the school or district (nine mentions), or were especially sought and placed by the principal (four mentions).

Regarding those who did not have supervisory responsibilities, only four respondents, two from Cohort I and two from Cohort II, indicated the nature of their search for an

administrative position. While three districts and seven high schools granted these individuals Level I interviews, only three granted Level II meetings--and none gave Level III hearings. This group of respondents reported it a difficult task to climb the ladder to an administrative job. Although the group was well educated, with all holding a Master's degree, the Principals Institute members felt they needed help in finding and obtaining a suitable position.

When asked how the Board of Education could help them get a suitable position, over 41 percent of the respondents wanted to receive mailings and position notices at their homes. Over one-quarter of the respondents (26.5 percent) wanted the Central Board to recommend, or inform candidates of "real" (i.e., genuinely open) positions. They also said that the Board of Education could hold employment or networking seminars for program graduates, or develop applicant lists and note graduate accomplishments (i.e., the work experience component) in the program for principals to see (17.6 percent mentions each). Along these same lines, it was suggested that meetings could be arranged between applicants and administrators (14.7 percent mentions). Finally, three program graduates wanted districts to be compelled to hire applicants within a definite time frame (8.8 percent).

Overall, the Institute itself won a great deal of praise from its participants. Phrases such as "the best experience of my life" were by no means rare. In this regard the Principals

Institute was a huge success. Yet, 17.6 percent also complained about the scarcity of appropriate employment opportunities; and two respondents wanted to see better, more experienced supervision in the Institute. (See Table 1, Appendix B).

Program Costs. According to the program participants, the fact that the tuition was subsidized was extremely important to them. They all agreed that they could not have afforded to pay the Bank Street College tuition. They also pointed out that they were responsible for other related expenses such as books and materials, childcare, transportation, parking, etc., all of which were necessary in order to participate in the program.

Program participants believed that the tuition subsidy was visible evidence of the Board of Education's commitment to improve the quality of leadership in the public schools, and because of this they had worked hard in order to prove that they were worthy of having been selected to participate.

Almost all participants were adamant that future participants should not be asked to pay any fees or tuition. They believed that such a policy would set a dangerous precedent and would eventually end up eliminating women and minorities, the very people the Institute was designed to recruit. They felt that if tuition charges were imposed, qualified applicants (most of whom probably would already have a master's degree) would be reluctant to apply. They also feared that people might be selected based on their ability to pay rather than on their

leadership potential.

If program costs have to be reduced, they recommended that fewer applicants should be accepted into the program instead of requiring the participants to pay. Only one person suggested that "if push comes to shove," applicants might be asked to pay what it would cost to obtain a similar degree in a City University of New York graduate program. Several people did recommend, however, that future participants be required to make a longer term commitment to continue working in the public schools.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Principals Institute was designed to identify talented minority and women educators who have demonstrated leadership ability, and to prepare them to become school administrators by providing them with a program which combines traditional coursework in administration and supervision with "field-based" experiences and ongoing support and guidance. Based on a review of program documents, discussions with both program administrators and participants, and participant survey, OREA concludes that the program was implemented as intended and was effective in increasing the pool of minorities and women who are qualified as school administrators and supervisors.

An average of about 50 principals have typically retired each year. Now that the early retirement plan for school principals has been implemented, however, 225 of the school system's 908 principals and 450 of the 2,157 assistant principals have applied to retire within the current year. The need to enlarge the pool of qualified and competent school administrators, therefore, is greater today than when the Principals Institute was first conceived.

The program as originally designed proved costly. Recognizing this, program administrators at Bank Street have restructured the program in order to reduce costs.

By continuing to fund the program, the Board of Education has demonstrated its commitment to increase the pool of women and minorities qualified to become school supervisors and

administrators. Once participants graduate and become certified, they will be available to fill administrative and supervisory positions, thereby increasing the diversity of the population of school administrators. Facilitation from the Central Board would further contribute to the attainment of the ultimate goal of a more diverse population of school administrators.

The overall results indicate that the Principals Institute has proven to be an excellent and effective means of developing the groundwork for creating a more diverse and multicultural staff throughout the administrative levels of the NYC Public Schools. In light of our findings OREA recommends that:

- program administrators and the NYC Board of Education endeavor to implement more proactive mechanisms for program graduates to secure information on principalship vacancies; and
- program administrators should continue their recruitment, selection and program modification activities so that they can further enlarge the pool of eligible minority and female NYC public school administrators and supervisors.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1
Pedagogical Supervisors in New York City Public School Community School Districts
by Gender and Ethnicity (June 1990)

Title	Number	Asian		African American		Latino		White	
		F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Principal	784	0.3%	0.4%	13%	8%	4%	6%	20%	48.3%
Ass't Principal	1,127	0.1	0.1	13	4	6	2	24	50.8
Supervisory Staff	532	0	0	11	5	4	3	51	26.0

TABLE 2
High School Pedagogical Supervisors by Gender and Ethnicity (June 1990)

Title	Number	Asians		African American		Latino		White	
		F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Principal	124	0.8%	0.8%	9%	6%	0.8%	2%	18%	64%
Ass't Principal	1,030	0.3	0.3	6	2	2	1	28	60

APPENDIX B

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		COHORTS			
			I N	II N	III N	
Base*: Total Respondents	(34)		(7)	(13)	(14)	
<u>Participated in Cohort</u>						
I	7	20.6	7	-	-	
II	13	38.2	-	13	-	
III	14	41.2	-	-	14	
Current Position in School System (Multiple Responses)						
Teacher (non-spec.)	10	29.4	2	5	3	
Assistant/Interim Acting Assistant Principal	8	23.5	1	5	2	
Coordinator/Grade Guide	5	14.7	-	1	4	
Interim Acting Principal	3	8.8	1	-	2	
School Director	2	5.9	1	1	-	
Dean	2	5.9	-	1	1	
Administrative Asst.	2	5.9	-	1	1	
Director/Asst. Director of Funded Programs	2	5.9	1	-	1	
Others ^b	3	8.8	1	1	1	

* This respondent base represents 100% of the respondents to the survey.
^b "Others" include 3 positions, each receiving one mention: Supervisor/Special Education, Special Education Teacher, and Administrative Intern.

(Continued)

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N %	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base*: Total Respondents	(34)	(7)	(13)	(14)
Current Title Is <u>Administrative or Supervisory?</u>				
Yes	16	3	7	6
No	18	4	6	8
Serve in an Administrative or Supervisory Capacity <u>Without Title?</u> ^b		(4)	(6)	(8)
Yes	11	2	3	6
No	7	2	3	2
Applied for any Administrative or Supervisory Position? ^b		(4)	(6)	(8)
Yes	9	3	4	2
No	6	1	2	3
No Answer	3	-	-	3

(Continued)

* This respondent base represents 100% of the respondents to the survey.
^b Based on the 18 respondents who are not in an administrative/supervisory title.

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base': Respondents Holding an Administrative/Supervisory Position Out of License	(11)	(2)	(3)	(6)
Description of Current Position (Multiple Responses)				
Supervise/coordinate grades and subjects	5	1	1	3
Teacher/teacher assigned	3	1	2	-
Maintain discipline	3	-	1	2
Staff/teacher training/development	3	-	-	3
Supervise non-academic functions (e.g., lunchroom, trips)	2	-	-	2
Handle student clerical work (e.g., transcripts, senior certification)	1	-	1	-
Chapter 1 management/seek grants	1	-	-	1
(Continued)				

* This respondent base represents 32.4% of the total respondents to the survey.

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base*: Respondents Who are in an Administrative/Supervisory Position, Whether Licensed or Unlicensed	(27)	(5)	(10)	(12)
<u>Process You Used to Get Hired</u>				
Interviewed by Principal, Superin- tendent, or Community School Board/C-30 process	9	3	3	3
Requested/appointed by Principal, Superintendent, or Community School Board	4	-	1	3
Announced availability for principalship	1	1	-	-
Advanced to principalship in own school	1	-	1	-
Screened by committee of parents and Community School Board	1	-	1	-
On new school's planning team	1	-	1	-
No Answer	10	1	3	6
(Continued)				

* This respondent base represents 32.4% of the total respondents to the survey.

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base ^a : Respondents Who are in an Administrative/Supervisory Position, Whether Licensed or Unlicensed	(27)	(5)	(10)	(12)
<u>How You Found Out About Position</u>				
Selected/placed by Principal/ Superintendent	11	2	3	6
Interviewed/notified at School/District	8	1	5	2
Worked as District Coordinator	2	1	-	1
Participant developed position	1	-	-	1
No Answer	5	1	2	2

(Continued)

^a This respondent base represents 79.4% of the total respondents to the survey.

Table 1

1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES ALL COHORTS			
(4)				
Base* : Respondents not Holding an Administrative/Super- visory Position Who have applied for a Position	Applied To	Level I Interviews	Level II Interviews	Level III Interviews
No. of Community School Districts	12	3	1	-
No. of High Schools	11	7	2	-
(Continued)				

* These four respondents came from Cohorts I and II, there were no respondents from Cohort III. The two respondents in Cohort I applied to two CSDs and completed two Level I interviews; all other data represents Cohort II respondents' answers.

TABLE 1

1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N %	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base ^a : Total Respondents	(34)	(7)	(13)	(14)
Current NYC Supervisory Licenses Held (Multiple Responses)				
Asst. Principal - Day Elem./JHS	26 76.5	7	7	12
Principal - Day Elem./JHS	23 67.6	4	7	12
Principal - Day HS	7 20.6	1	6	-
Asst. Principal - H.S. Admin	7 20.6	1	6	-
Principal - Independent Alternative School	6 17.6	-	6	-
Asst. Principal - Day H.S. Supv.	4 11.8	1	3	-
Principal - Special Ed.	2 5.9	1	1	-
Asst. Principal - Special Ed.	1 2.9	1	-	-
No Answer/None	2 5.9	-	-	2

^a This respondent base represents 100% of the respondents to the survey.

Table 1

1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		COHORTS		
			I N	II N	III N
	N	%	(7)	(13)	(14)
Base ^a : Total Respondents	(34)				
How Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs or other Board Offices Can Help Find Positions for Graduates (Multiple Responses)					
Personal mailings of ads/positions	14	41.2	3	5	6
Recommend/interview/inform candidates for new "real" positions	9	26.5	2	3	4
Develop applicant lists/note accomplish- ments for principals	6	17.6	1	1	4
Hold employment/networking seminars for graduates	6	17.6	2	3	1
Hold meetings between applicants/admini- strators	5	14.7	1	1	3
Limit time for Board/Districts to hire applicants	3	8.8	-	1	2
Others ^b	3	8.8	-	1	2
No Answer	6	17.6	1	3	2

^a This respondent base represents 63% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants. (Continued)

^b "Others" include such ideas as reduction of bureaucracy in hiring, stress need for diversity in hiring, setting guidelines about C-30 process for school districts.

Table 1
1991-1992 Principals Institute
Follow-Up Survey

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N %	COHORTS		
		I N	II N	III N
Base: Total Respondents	(34)	(7)	(13)	(14)
Other Comments and Suggestions (Multiple Responses)				
Participant praise for Institute	6 17.6	2	-	4
More opportunities wanted for jobs/ inconsistent, prejudicial hiring practices	6 17.6	-	3	3
Want better supervision, experienced administrators	2 5.9	1	-	1
Others ^b	5 14.7	2	-	3
No Answer	21 61.8	4	10	7

* This respondent base represents 100% of the respondents to the survey.

^b "Others" include 7 comments, each receiving one mention, including: newsletter for graduates, more testing of student results, exposing interns to many school situations, teaching moral/self values.

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES

Bank Street College of Education. The Principals Institute Program Update: Spring 1991. New York, N.Y., 1991.

Congress of the United States, Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. "Revising the Role of the School Principal," In Toward Equal Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Jones, Effie H., and Xenia P. Montenegro. Women and Minorities in School Administration. Washington, D.C., Office of Minority Affairs, American Association of School Administrators, December, 1985.

New York City Public Schools. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action, The Chancellor's 1990-91 Monitoring and Implementation Report. Brooklyn, NY, May, 1991.

Smith, Stuart C., and Philip K. Piele, editors. School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence. Eugene, Oregon. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1989.